

Serial No.: 10/759,790

Attorney Docket No.: 2000P09085US01

**REMARKS**

Claims 15-19 and 21-25 are pending.

Claims 14-17, 19, 21-23, and 25 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Goldman et al., EP Patent Publication No. 0 588 101 A2 ("Goldman"). In order for there to be anticipation, each and every element of the claimed invention must be present in a single prior reference. Applicants respectfully submit that the claimed invention is not taught, suggested, or implied by Goldman.

As described in the Specification, and in response to the previous Official Action, one aspect of the present invention relates to recording caller ID information in association with an answering machine and transmitting it to a remote location, such as at a call control system local to a retrieving party, to allow making a call to that number. More particularly, caller ID information can be transmitted to a remote location when an answering machine is accessed remotely. That is, the system can send the caller ID information to a call control system more closely associated with the remote caller location than the answering machine location. Thus, claim 15 recites

"a Caller ID data recording unit configured to record Caller ID data from callers calling said system, the caller ID data including a calling party number, the Caller ID data recording unit being associated with a first call control system; an interface configured to transmit the recorded Caller ID data to a remote location when the recorded messages are retrieved; and a second call control system local to a remote caller calling the system and configured to receive the transmitted Caller ID data; wherein said second call control system includes a Caller ID storage and retrieval unit configured to cause the transmitted calling party number included in the received Caller ID data to be called by said second call control system, said second call control system being a call control system more closely connected to the remote caller than the first call control system"

and claim 21 recites:

Serial No.: 10/759,790

Attorney Docket No.: 2000P09085US01

recording Caller ID data from the callers calling said answering device, the caller ID data including a calling party number, the answering device being associated with a local call control system;

transmitting the recorded Caller ID data to a remote location when the recorded messages are retrieved by a remote caller; and

wherein said transmitting comprises transmitting the recorded Caller ID data to an apparatus in a remote call control system wherein said remote call control system includes a Caller ID storage and retrieval unit configured to cause the transmitted calling party number included in the received Caller ID data to be called by said remote call control system, said remote call control system being a call control system more closely connected to the remote caller than the first call control system

In contrast, as discussed in response to the previous Official Action, while Goldman apparently transfers an ANI number to a caller as a header in a voice message retrieval message, the message header number that was transferred does not appear to be used to call back the corresponding number from a remote location.

Instead, while the header is played to the caller, the ANI number itself is separately transferred to a local "Callback Number register 80" which is then used by the local PBX to "transfer" the call to the calling in party. (See, Col. 17, lines 3-11). The calling-in party, however, is local to the PBX. A remotely transferred number is not itself used to call back the message leaving party. Only the local number at the Callback Number register 80 is so used.

Moreover, Goldman does not provide a local and remote call control systems including features as generally recited in the claims at issue. The callback number register 80 is local to the answering service. Goldman contains no hint that the number can be transferred to a call control system close to the remote caller.

That is, Goldman does not appear to allow a party to call in remotely to make a phone call using an ANI number. Instead, in Goldman, a local subscriber 21 calls in via the local PBX network, i.e., he is local to the network. He can then call the message leaving party, but only via the local PBX. Nowhere does Goldman provide for a remote caller receiving calling party ANI numbers at a remote location associated with

Serial No.: 10/759,790

Attorney Docket No.: 2000P09085US01

a remote call control system and making a call therefrom.

Paragraph 5 of the Official Action states “[b]ecause Goldman discloses the number is transferred from the Callback Number register to the PBX and because the PBX is close to the remote caller, Goldman teaches the number can be transferred to a call control system close to the remote caller.” As discussed above, it is absolutely incorrect to assert that Goldman teaches the remote caller receiving the ANI.

Indeed, it is quite clear from the discussion in FIG. 6 in Goldman that there is no remote caller whatsoever. Instead, a local subscriber calling from his local subscriber station accesses his local messaging system via his local PBX; if desired, the local subscriber can call the message-leaving party. He does so via the local PBX, which uses the number stored in the register 80. However, it is not a remote PBX; and it is the only “call control system” used in the entire operation.

Further, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection does not properly address the limitations of the claims. Applicant's claims explicitly recite first and second call control systems, at least one of which is remote. The PTO's rejection completely ignores this recitation. In the PTO's rejection and indeed in Goldman, there is one and only one PBX: the local PBX. Thus, any element corresponding to, inter alia, the recited “second call control system local to a remote caller calling the system and configured to receive the transmitted Caller ID data” is utterly missing. As such, it is axiomatic that there can be no anticipation. As such, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection.

Claims 18 and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goldman in view of Kang et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,094,075 (“Kang”). Applicants respectfully submit that the claimed invention is not taught, suggested, or implied by Goldman or Kang, either singly or in combination. Goldman has been discussed above. Kang is relied on for allegedly teaching the “nifty feature” of a wireless carrier system. However, like Goldman, Kang fails to teach, suggest or imply a remote call control system or use of the transferred number to make the return call, as

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

SEP 30 2008

Serial No.: 10/759,790

Attorney Docket No.: 2000P09085US01

generally recited in the claims at issue. As such, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection.

Finally, Applicant respectfully requests that the Patent Office reconsider use of the term "nifty feature" as its connotations are unnecessarily pejorative and appears to indicate an improper bias against Applicant's invention.


For all of the above reasons, Applicant respectfully submit that the application is in condition for allowance, which allowance is earnestly solicited.

Date: September 30, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

SIEMENS CORPORATION  
Customer Number: 28524  
Intellectual Property Department  
170 Wood Avenue South  
Iselin, New Jersey 0883

Attn: Elsa Keller  
Direct Dial: 1-732-321-3026

By:   
Greg H. Leitich  
Registration No. 39,745  
Attorney for Applicants  
Tel.: 512-469-0063  
Fax: 512-469-0023